



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/903,899	07/12/2001	Paul Wolejko	SAA-0055	2016

23569 7590 11/05/2004

SQUARE D COMPANY
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
1415 SOUTH ROSELLE ROAD
PALATINE, IL 60067

EXAMINER

PEREZ DAPLE, AARON C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2154

DATE MAILED: 11/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/903,899

Applicant(s)

<UNKNOWN>

Examiner

Aaron C Perez-Daple

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 August 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 39-61 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 39-61 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Action is in response to RCE filed 8/2/04, which has been fully considered.
2. Claims 39-61 are presented for examination.
3. This Action is non-Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. **Claims 52-54, 56, 57, 59 and 60** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dummermuth (US 6,073,053).
6. Dummermuth is cited by the Examiner in a previous Office Action.
7. As for claim 52, Dummermuth discloses a control system comprising:
an input module structured to respond to a condition by transmitting a representative signal (optical sensor 26, Fig. 1.; col. 3, lines 27-48); and
an output module (I/O card 18, Fig. 2) operably coupled to the input module, the output module including a reflex function structured to produce a state signal (output signal 29, Figs. 1 and 3; col. 3, lines 7-14) in response to receiving the representative signal from the input module, the output module being structured to execute the reflex function without requiring input from a controller (col. 2, lines 19-24).

Art Unit: 2154

8. As for claim 53, Dummermuth discloses the control system as defined in claim 52, further comprising the controller operably coupled to the input module and the output module (Figs. 1 and 2).
9. As for claim 54, Dummermuth discloses the control system as defined in claim 53, further comprising a configuration tool operably coupled to the output module, the configuration tool being structured to configure the reflex function (col. 2, lines 29-38; col. 4, lines 16-19).
10. As for claim 56, Dummermuth discloses the control system as defined in claim 52, wherein the reflex function is at least one of a Boolean logic function, a comparison function, a counter function, a timer function, and an edge detection function (col. 2, lines 29-31).
11. As for claim 57, Dummermuth discloses the control system as defined in claim 52, wherein the output module is coupled to the input module by a network (Figs. 1 and 2).
12. As for claim 59, Dummermuth discloses the control system as defined in claim 52, wherein the first reflex function is specified in an object dictionary (memory 52 and 54, Fig. 2; col. 3, line 65 – col. 4, line 7).
13. As for claim 60, Dummermuth discloses the control system as defined in claim 59, wherein the object dictionary is embedded within a master scanner (central processor 12, Fig. 2; col. 3, line 65 – col. 4, line 7).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2154

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. **Claims 39-42, 44, 46, 47, 49, 50 and 55** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dummermuth (US 6,073,053) (hereinafter Dummermuth) in view of McLaughlin et al. (US 5,988,847) (hereinafter McLaughlin).
 16. McLaughlin is cited by the Examiner in a previous Office Action
 17. As for claim 39, Dummermuth discloses a control system comprising:
 - an input module structured to respond to a condition by transmitting a representative signal (col. 3, lines 27-48; optical sensor 26, Fig. 1); and
 - an output module (I/O card 18, Fig. 2) operably coupled to the input module, the output module including *circuitry* configurable with a first reflex function at a first time and a second reflex function at a second time, the first reflex function being structured to produce a state signal (output signal 29, Figs. 1 and 3; col. 3, lines 7-14), in response to receiving the representative signal from the input module (col. 2, lines 29-31; col. 4, lines 16-19).
- Although Dummermuth teaches programmable and configurable circuitry, Dummermuth does not explicitly disclose that the circuitry may comprise firmware. It is well-known and obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that firmware, hardware, and software perform equivalent functions and may be substituted for each other or used in combination, as taught explicitly by McLaughlin (col. 4, line 65 – col. 5, line 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify McLaughlin by using firmware in order to provide an easily programmable circuit.

18. As for claim 40, Dummermuth discloses a control system as defined in claim 39,

wherein:

the first reflex function comprises at least one of a Boolean logic function, a comparison function, a counter function, a timer function, and an edge detection function (col. 2, lines 29-31) and

the second reflex function comprises at least one of a Boolean logic function, a comparison function, a counter function, a timer function, and an edge detection function, wherein the first reflex function is different than the second reflex function (col. 2, lines 29-31).

19. As for claim 41, Dummermuth discloses the control system as defined in claim 39, further comprising a computer based tool to configure the firmware with one of the first reflex function and the second reflex function (col. 2, lines 29-38; col. 4, lines 16-19).

20. As for claim 42, Dummermuth discloses the control system as defined in claim 39, wherein the output module is coupled to the input module by a bus (Fig. 2; col. 3, lines 49-51).

21. As for claim 44, Dummermuth discloses the control system as defined in claim 39, wherein the output module is coupled to the input module by a network (Figs. 1 and 2).

22. As for claim 46, Dummermuth discloses the control system as defined in claim 39, further comprising a master scanner operatively coupled to the input module and the output module (col. 4, lines 13-16).

23. As for claim 47, Dummermuth discloses the control system as defined in claim 39, wherein the master scanner comprises a programmable logic controller (central processor 12, Fig. 2).
24. As for claim 49, Dummermuth discloses the control system as defined in claim 39, wherein the first reflex function is specified in an object dictionary (memory 52 and 54, Fig. 2; col. 3, line 65 – col. 4, line 7).
25. As for claim 50, Dummermuth discloses the control system as defined in claim 39, wherein the object dictionary is embedded within a master scanner (central processor 12, Fig. 2; col. 3, line 65 – col. 4, line 7).
26. As for claim 55, although Dummermuth teaches programmable and configurable circuitry, Dummermuth does not explicitly disclose that the circuitry may comprise firmware. It is well-known and obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that firmware, hardware, and software perform equivalent functions and may be substituted for each other or used in combination, as taught explicitly by McLaughlin (col. 4, line 65 – col. 5, line 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify McLaughlin by using firmware in order to provide an easily programmable circuit.
27. **Claims 43, 45, 48, and 51** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Dummermuth and McLaughlin in further view of Edwards et al (US 5,938,754) (hereinafter Edwards).
28. Edwards is cited by the Examiner in a previous Office Action
29. As for claims 43 and 45 Dummermuth and McLaughlin do not specifically teach the use of CANopen protocol. Edwards teaches the use of CANopen protocol in industrial

manufacturing applications for detection and correction of transmission errors caused by electromagnetic interference (col. 2, lines 23-38). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Dummermuth and McLaughlin by using CANopen protocol over either a network or a bus because this would provide an easily configurable system and allow for detection and correction of transmission errors caused by electromagnetic interference, as taught by Edwards above.

30. As for claim 48, Dummermuth and McLaughlin do not specifically disclose a reflexive control system wherein the master scanner is a field bus coupler. Edwards teaches the use of a field bus and a field bus coupler in an industrial control system for easily configuring a system and for detection and correction of transmission errors caused by electromagnetic interference (col. 1, lines 9-22; field bus coupler is inherent for coupling with the field bus). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Dummermuth and McLaughlin by using a field bus coupler as the master scanner in order to employ a CAN network because this would provide the advantages of an easily configurable system and detection and correction of transmission errors caused by electromagnetic interference, as taught by Edwards above.

31. As for claim 51, Dummermuth does not specifically disclose assigning first and second addresses to the input and output modules, respectively. Edwards teaches assigning addresses to all devices connected to a network for use in a CANopen network which provides the advantages of easily configuring a system and for detection and correction of transmission errors caused by electromagnetic interference (col. 1, lines 9-22 ; field bus coupler is inherent for coupling with the field bus). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Dummermuth by assigning first and second addresses to the input and output modules, respectively, in order to employ a CAN network which has the advantages of an easily configurable system and detection and correction of transmission errors caused by electromagnetic interference, as taught by Edwards.

32. **Claims 58 and 61** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Dummermuth in view of Edwards.

33. As for claim 58, Dummermuth and McLaughlin do not specifically teach the use of CANopen protocol. Edwards teaches the use of CANopen protocol in industrial manufacturing applications for detection and correction of transmission errors caused by electromagnetic interference (col. 2, lines 23-38). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Dummermuth and McLaughlin by using CANopen protocol over either a network or a bus because this would provide an easily configurable system and allow for detection and correction of transmission errors caused by electromagnetic interference, as taught by Edwards above.

34. As for claim 61, Dummermuth does not specifically disclose assigning first and second addresses to the input and output modules, respectively. Edwards teaches assigning addresses to all devices connected to a network for use in a CANopen network which provides the advantages of easily configuring a system and for detection and correction of transmission errors caused by electromagnetic interference (col. 1, lines 9-22 ; field bus coupler is inherent for coupling with the field bus). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Dummermuth by assigning first

Art Unit: 2154

and second addresses to the input and output modules, respectively, in order to employ a CAN network which has the advantages of an easily configurable system and detection and correction of transmission errors caused by electromagnetic interference, as taught by Edwards.

Response to Arguments

35. Applicant's arguments filed 8/2/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
36. With respect to claim 39, Applicant asserts that Dummermuth fails to disclose a firmware configurable with a first reflex function at a first time and a second reflex function at a second time. The Examiner concedes that Dummermuth does not *explicitly* teach the use of firmware. However, this limitation is arguably inherent to Dummermuth for programming the I/O circuit and is further taught explicitly by McLaughlin, as detailed in the 103 rejection above. Applicant further asserts that Dummermuth fails to disclose configuring the device with a first reflex function at a first time and a second reflex function at a second time. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Col. 2, lines 29-31, specifically recites that the logic circuit of Dummermuth "may include a timer or a counter," which are two distinct reflex functions from the set listed in Applicant's claim 40. Furthermore, Dummermuth clearly discloses configuring the logic circuit in col. 4, lines 17-19 and 43-46. Therefore, claim 39 is properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Dummermuth in view of McLaughlin.
37. Dependent claims 40-51 are properly rejected for the same reasons as claim 39.

Art Unit: 2154

38. With respect to claim 52, Applicant asserts that Dummermuth fails to teach executing the reflex function without requiring input from a controller. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Noting that the claim does not require the presence of a controller, the Examiner interprets that the central processor 12 and I/O rack 16 of Dummermuth, Fig. 1, together comprise the recited output module. Under this interpretation, an input from a separate controller is not required. Therefore claim 52 is properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Dummermuth.
39. Dependent claims 52-61 are properly rejected for the same reasons as claim 52.

Conclusion


40. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US 6,463,339 B1, note entire circuit performs a "reflex" function.
41. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aaron C Perez-Daple whose telephone number is (571) 272-3974. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information

Art Unit: 2154

about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

 11/1/04

Aaron Perez-Daple

N. E. Haeby